REMARKS

This application has been carefully considered in connection with the Examiner's Final Office Action dated March 20, 2007. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the following.

Summary of Rejections

Claims 1-22 were pending at the time of the Office Action.

Claims 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by Couch, et al. (Publication No. US 2003/0126109).

Claims 1, 4-12 and 21 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landfield, et al. (U.S. Patent No.5,928,333) in view of Couch.

Claims 2-3, and 22 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landfield in view of Couch as applied to claim 1 and 21 above, and further in view of Robinson (U.S. Publication No. US 2003/0115366).

Claims 15-17 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Couch as applied to claims 13 and 14 above, and further in view of Robinson.

Claims 18-20 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Couch in view of Robinson as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Landfield.

Summary of Response

Claims 1, 4, 7, 13, 21, and 22 were amended.

Claims 5, 9, 11, 14, and 16 were previously presented.

Claims 2-3, 6, 8, 10, 12, 15, and 17-20 remain as originally filed.

Remarks and Arguments are provided below.

Summary of Claims Pending

Claims 1-22 are currently pending following this response.

Applicant Initiated Interview

Applicant thanks Primary Examiner Alhashemi and Examiner Cao for their time and consideration of the arguments presented in the telephone interview on May 9, 2007. In the interview the limitation in claim 21 of "verifying whether the test application is operating properly" was discussed. Primary Examiner Alhashemi and Examiner Cao clarified that the limitation "verifying" was broadly being interpreted to be disclosed by Landfield. For example, Primary Examiner Alhashemi referenced column 5, lines 20-57 where Landfield discloses that messages may be received from the public network 12 and placed on the queue. Primary Examiner Alhashemi presented an interpretation of this disclosure that the simple fact that the messages are delivered to the queue is verification that the application that sent the message is operating properly. That is, if the application that sent the message was not operating properly then the message would not have been delivered to the queue in the first place.

In the interview the disclosure in column 7, lines 3-10 of Landfield was also discussed. In this disclosure, Landfield teaches that administrators of the messaging systems operating on the firewall host systems 26, 28, and 30 may view the header of messages in attempting to solve problems with their messaging systems. Landfield discloses that improper addressing of source and recipients and other information is contained in the headers. Examiner Cao indicated that solving problems of improper addressing of the source and recipients in the messages is disclosure of verifying the application that sent the message is operating properly. That is, if the message is properly addressed then the application that sent the message is operating properly,

11

whereas if the message is improperly addressed then the application that sent the message is not operating properly. Primary Examiner Alhashemi and Examiner Cao suggested amending claim 21 to further clarify the "verifying" limitation. Claims 13 and 21 have been amended herein to further clarify the "verifying" limitation.

Response to Rejections

The present disclosure is generally related to a message manager system for reading messages from a queue. The messages may be read from the queue by identifying a host computer implementing a messaging service and by identifying the queue, as disclosed in paragraph 0029. The present disclosure is more particularly directed to a message manager for reading messages from a system under test. The message manager system of the present disclosure is provided with a mutually exclusive option of destructively or non-destructively reading messages from the queue. The non-destructive read is useful for verifying the content of the message while minimally impacting the system under test, as disclosed in paragraphs 0018 and 0025. The destructive read is useful when messages accumulate on the queue and impede operations of the system under test, as disclosed in paragraph 0025. For example, the destructive reading of messages may be desired when the intended recipient of the message is not yet mature enough to be employed as a message reader. As disclosed in paragraph 0018, when a test application outputs a message to the queue, the message manager may display the messages read from the queue so as to verify that the messages output by the test application are correctly structured, that the messages contain correct information in the fields of the message structure, and that the messages are sent to the right destination, for example. The claims have been

12

amended herein to more particularly point out these unique features. A detailed discussion of how the amendments distinguish from the prior art of record follows.

Claim 1:

I.   There is no motivation to combine the teachings of Landfield and Couch.

The Final Office Action relied on the disclosure in Couch to teach the limitations of "the first module is selectable in a mutually exclusive manner between destructively reading the messages from the queue and non-destructively reading the message from the queue". Couch discloses in paragraph 0033 a table function that is a user defined function (UDF) that is able to destructively or non-destructively read message data stored in the message queue 30. The Final Office Action stated that it would have been obvious to have modified Landfield by the teaching of Couch "to add the function of selecting between destructively reading and non-destructively reading since this function provides an effective and flexible way to manage messages in the queue".

Landfield is directed to a system that allows for the efficient updating and maintenance of electronic mail aliases and allows for efficient proactive management of electronic mail message queues (column 8, lines 9-14). In particular, Landfield discloses that the messages in the queue are processed "in order to deliver the messages within the mail message queue" (column 5, lines 30-33). Further, Landfield discloses that there are often messages that are undeliverable for a variety of reasons wherein the undeliverable messages "tax the processing resources of the firewall host systems 26, 28, and 30" (column 5, lines 33-38). Landfield discloses an electronic mail message management system in order to quickly and efficiently deliver deliverable messages and remove (bounce, delete, or reroute) messages that are

undeliverable so as to free up processing resources (column 5, lines 39-43; column 6, lines 25-29).

Because Landfield discloses that messages in the queue are processed in order to deliver the messages, it is unclear as to why one skilled in the art would be motivated to have an option to destructively read messages that are deliverable from the message queue. In this case, destructively reading deliverable messages from the queue would prevent the messages from being delivered.

Also, it is unclear as to why one skilled in the art would be motivated to have an option to destructively read messages that are undeliverable. In particular, Landfield discloses to remove messages that are undeliverable because they tax processing resources. As such, destructively reading messages from the message queue and displaying the read message would require the use of additional processing resources. That is, a certain amount of processing resources would still be required to display the undeliverable messages that have been destructively read from the message queue. Therefore the undeliverable message would continue to tax processing resources.

MPEP 2143.01(V) states:

> "If proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified
> unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation
> to make the proposed modification. *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125
> (Fed. Cir. 1984)."

Applicant asserts that destructively reading messages from the message queue of Landfield would unsatisfactorily modify Landfield from its intended purpose. Destructively reading deliverable messages from the queue would deviate from the intended purpose of delivering the messages in the mail queue of Landfield. Similarly, destructively reading

14

undeliverable messages and displaying the read message, as required by the claims, would deviate from the intended purpose of removing undeliverable messages that tax processing resources.

As the present disclosure is directed to the management of message queues in a test environment, it is desirable to be able to select between destructively reading messages from the queue and non-destructively reading messages from the queue. Looking to paragraphs 0018 and 0025 of the present disclosure, non-destructively reading messages from the queue enables the review of the messages with minimal impact to the systems under test because the messages are not diverted from their normal receiver. Further, in some test environments, some software which receives messages may not be mature enough to be employed as a message reader during initial testing of a message sending component. In this case, destructively reading messages from the queue enables the review of the message while also removing accumulated messages that may impede system operations.

II.   Neither Landfield nor Couch disclose one or more of the second systems are not mature enough to read the plurality of messages from the queue.

As neither Landfield nor Couch are directed to managing message queues in a test environment, they do not provide any teaching or suggestion that one or more of the second systems are not mature enough to read the plurality of messages from the queue. Applicant has amended claim 1 to include this limitation to further clarify that the present disclosure is particularly directed to managing messages in a test environment.

15

III.   Neither Landfield nor Couch disclose a first module that is not a normal receiver of the messages that is selectable between non-destructively and destructively reading messages from the queue.

Couch discloses a system wherein a table function reads (destructively or non-destructively) message data from a queue, however, the table function of Couch is a normal receiver of the message data. Applicant notes that Landfield is not a normal receiver of messages from the queue, rather Landfield is a mediator or manager of messages to deliver messages that are deliverable to their normal receiver and to remove messages that are undeliverable. This combination of limitations further raises the question of why one skilled in the art would be motivated to combine the teaching of destructively or non-destructively reading messages from the queue using a system disclosed by Couch that is a normal receiver of the message data with a system disclosed by Landfield that is not a normal receiver of messages.

Dependent claims 2-12 are similarly not taught or suggested by the prior art of record for at least the reasons detailed in I-III above.

Claim 13:

Claim 13 includes limitations similar to those presented in claim 1. As such, the arguments presented in I and III are herein repeated for claim 13.

IV.   Couch does not disclose verifying that the message has a correct structure, that information in fields of the message structure contain correct information, **and** that a destination of the message is correct.

16

Applicant asserts that Couch does not provide any disclosure of verifying that the message has a correct structure, that information in fields of the message structure contain correct information, and that a destination of the message is correct as currently required by claim 13.

Further, while Landfield discloses in column 7, lines 3-10 that an administrator may solve problems with improper addressing of recipients of a message, this disclosure does not provide any teaching or suggestion of verifying that the message has a correct structure, that information in fields of the message structure contain correct information, **and** that a destination of the message is correct as currently required by claim 13.

MPEP 2142 states:

> "To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." (Emphasis Added)

Applicant asserts that Landfield alone or in combination with any other prior art of record does not disclose **all** the claim limitations as currently recited.

V.   Neither Couch nor Landfield disclose selecting a host computer implementing the messaging service by inputting a host computer identification.

The Final Office Action relied on the disclosure of paragraph 0054 of Couch to teach selecting a host computer implementing the messaging service by inputting a host computer identification. Looking to the disclosure Couch, the disclosure of paragraph 0054 must be interpreted in the context of the disclosure. Paragraphs 0037-0063 are directed to a table function building application to build a table function that reads message data and converts it into a relational table format. The disclosure of the table function is exclusively directed to reading

17

message data from messages that are received on a message queue 30 of a computer system 10c. Paragraph 0054 of Couch discloses that a given computer system may be configured to run one or more queue managers each of which may control one or more message queues. Therefore, when building a table function on a given computer system to read message data from the message queue of the given computer system, a user needs to specify which of the plurality of message queues on the given computer system to read message data from. That is, "a user must provide information regarding the location of the queue on which message data of interest resides" (Couch, paragraph 0054). Couch discloses an example that a user may specify the location through a service point and policy 231 in MQ Series Integrator®. One skilled in the art will recognize that the service point is the logical end-point which a message is received and includes an identification of the queue manager and queue. Therefore the disclosure of providing the location of the queue is not disclosure of selecting a host computer implementing the messaging service by inputting a host computer identification as required by the claims, but rather is disclosure of specifying which of a plurality of queue managers and which of a plurality of queues managed by the queue manager on a given computer system to read message data from.

Further, as discussed in argument II under claim 13 in the response filed on September 19, 2006, Landfield does not disclose selecting a host computer implementing the messaging service by inputting a host computer identification.

Dependent claims 14-20 are similarly not taught or suggested by the prior art of record for at least the reasons detailed in I and III-V above.

18

Claim 21:

Claim 21 includes limitations similar to those presented in claims 1 and 13. As such, the arguments presented in I and III-V are herein repeated for claim 21.

Dependent claim 22 is similarly not taught or suggested by the prior art of record for at least the reasons detailed in I and III-V above.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance for the reasons stated above. If the Examiner has any questions or comments or otherwise feels it would be helpful in expediting the application, he is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (972) 731-2288.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any further fees associated with any of the foregoing papers submitted herewith, or to credit any overpayment thereof, to Deposit Account No. 21-0765, Sprint.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 21, 2007

Michael W. Piper
Reg. No. 39,800

CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
5700 Granite Parkway, Suite 330   ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT
Plano, Texas 75024
(972) 731-2288
(972) 731-2289 (facsimile)

19